

At some point, Plaintiff was released on parole from prison, but failed to update his current mailing address. Additionally, he failed to comply with deadlines set forth in the Case Management Order. Therefore, on July 16, 2013, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause by July 31, 2013 why this action should not be dismissed for failure to abide by rules of this Court

and failure to prosecute. The Court also ordered Plaintiff to verify his correct contact information. Plaintiff failed to make such showings, and on August 22, 2013 the Court dismissed his case without prejudice. In the instant Motion, Plaintiff asks the Court to reopen this case and another case dismissed by the Honorable Henry Autrey. Plaintiff's most current address information indicates he has returned to ERDCC.

The Court liberally construes Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen as a motion for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). *See, e.g., Collum v. PayPal*, No. 8:12CV153, 2012 WL 3760792, *1 (D. Neb. Aug. 29, 2012). Under Rule 60(b), district courts may "vacate a judgment that was secured through a party's misrepresentations, among other things, and for 'any other reason justifying relief.'" *Harley v. Zoesch*, 413 F.3d 866, 870 (2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3), (6)). However, "Rule 60(b) authorizes relief in only the most exceptional of cases." *Int'l Bhd. of Elec. Workers, Local Union No. 545 v. Hope Elec. Corp.*, 293 F.3d 409, 415 (8th Cir. 2002).

Here, Plaintiff has failed to show the requisite exceptional circumstances. At the time Plaintiff filed his Motion, over five months had passed since the Court dismissed this action. Additionally, Plaintiff breached his affirmative duty to "promptly notify the Clerk and all other parties to the proceedings of any change in his . . . address and telephone number." Local Rule 45-2.06(B). Failure to notify the Court of a change address within 30 days is cause for dismissal. *Id.* Therefore, the Court will deny Plaintiff's Motion, without prejudice to filing a new Complaint.¹ Any new Complaint filed by Plaintiff should take into consideration the Court's

¹ The Court also notes, in his Motion, Plaintiff seems to assert new claims by stating that, while some previously named Defendants have resigned from their employment with ERDCC, "the torment goes on." ECF No. 17 at 2. He further indicates his desire for an immediate "transfer and/or restraining order." ECF No. 17 at 2. Plaintiff's new claims are best addressed in a new Complaint.

Order of Partial Dismissal [ECF No. 8] and Memorandum and Order dated January 30, 2013 [ECF No. 7], in which the Court dismissed, without prejudice, all of Plaintiff's claims, except his claims for monetary relief against Defendants Derek Dickey and Thomas Bromley, in their individual capacities, for allegedly violating Plaintiff's rights under the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution by physically and sexually assaulting him.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Donahue Goins' Motion to Reopen Case [ECF No. 17] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall mail to Plaintiff Donahue Goins the Court's form for filing a Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Dated this 16th Day of April, 2014.



E. RICHARD WEBBER
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE